

## **Roundtable I: Water Diplomacy - Theory to Practice**

**Panel Members:** Susskind, Choudhury, Campbell-Ferrari, and Koch; Moderator (Islam)

### **May 12 200PM – 430PM**

- |            |   |   |
|------------|---|---|
| 200-210PM  | Islam   | Introduce the premise and provide the context |
| 210- 220PM | Susskind  |   |
| 220-230PM  | Choudhury   |   |
| 230-240PM  | Cambell-Ferrari   |   |
| 240-250PM  | Koch  |   |
| 250-300PM  | Break and Organize around Roundtable (one question per table; please choose your question and table)  |   |
| 300-320PM  | Each table chooses a presenter and discusses the question within the context of the premise.  |   |
| 320-350PM  | Each table presenter summarizes the discussion from their Roundtable and share with the entire group (3-4 minute per table)                                   |   |
| 350-430PM  | Panel reflects and responds to questions and issues raised by the audience during their discussion; Open the floor for follow up questions from the audience. |   |

## **PREMISE: Water Diplomacy - Theory to Practice**

### **200-210PM Islam Introduce the premise and provide the context**

For Roundtable I – Water Diplomacy: Theory to Practice – the premise is organized around three thematic ideas: Complexity thinking, Representation for effective action, and Water Diplomacy Framework.

#### **Complexity Thinking**

The Water Diplomacy Framework (WDF) aims to understand and resolve water related conflicts. It acknowledges that traditional problem solving frames are adequate to address simple problems where reasonable scientific certainty and consensus about intervention exists. The WDF hypothesizes that when water challenges stem from complex – interconnected, uncertain, unpredictable, and boundary crossing – system dynamics with feedback, traditional frames for problem solving can be limiting or counter-productive.

#### **Representation for Effective Action**

A recurrent factor for such limitations is that traditional problem solving frames often separate the observation-based technical (what is) from the value-based socio-political (what ought to be) dimensions of the problem. The WDF further hypothesizes that when dealing with complex problems, these dimensions cannot be de-coupled. The WDF acknowledges both the limits to knowledge – objectivity of observations and subjectivity of interpretation – and the contingent nature of our action.

## **Water Diplomacy Framework**

The WDF proposes a principled pragmatic approach to negotiation that is based on credible scientific knowledge mediated through equity and sustainability as guiding principles for contextual policy action. The WDF approach emphasizes that, when addressing complex water problems all parties have a legitimate right to have a voice about the evidence used and its interpretation, the past evidence and future implications of an intervention, metrics of equity and sustainability, and the package of actionable solutions. These parties include users and producers of water knowledge, managers, technical experts, policy makers, decision makers, and politicians. Furthermore, the WDF asserts that parties need to seek consensus on guiding principles and mutual value creation when negotiating a resolution.

### **Questions for the Panel (each panel member has 10-minute to discuss)**

**210- 220PM Susskind**

**220-230PM Choudhury**

**230-240PM Cambell-Ferrari**

**240-250PM Koch**

Given the time allocated (10-minute per panel member), you may consider focusing on a few questions; we will start with the above premise and ask each panel member to (a) provide their assessment of the premise including the conventional wisdom supporting (refuting) the premise? (b) What are the gaps in water diplomacy theory (e.g., intellectual puzzles)? (c) What are the gaps in practice (e.g., implementation and evaluation problems)? (d) What are the gaps in translating the theory into policy and practice for effective water governance and management? (e) What is our path forward to address complex water problems? For example, how can water diplomacy be operationalized by scientific, academic, and practicing professionals in concert with or in conflict with the traditional diplomacy conducted by the policy professionals and politicians?

### **Questions for the Roundtable (each Roundtable will have one question and 20-minute to discuss and present their summary to the audience and the panel)**

**250-300PM Break and Organize around Roundtable (one question per table; please choose your question and table)**

**300-320PM Each table chooses a presenter and discusses the question within the context of the premise.**

**320-350PM Each table presenter summarizes the discussion from their Roundtable and share with the entire group (3-4 minute per table)**

- What are the gaps in water diplomacy theory (e.g., intellectual puzzles)?
- What are the gaps in water diplomacy practice (e.g., implementation & evaluation)?
- What are the gaps in translating water diplomacy theory and practice into effective water governance and management?
- What is our path forward to address complex water problems? For example, how can water diplomacy be operationalized by scientific, academic, and practicing professionals in concert with or in conflict with the traditional diplomacy conducted by the policy professionals and politicians?

**350-430PM Panel reflects and responds to questions and issues raised by the audience during their discussion; Open the floor for follow up questions from the audience.**